

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed June 20, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 and 19 remain in this application, where claims 17-18 and 20 have been canceled by this amendment without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications.

In the Office Action, claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,658,325 (Zweig) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0081937 (Yamada). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16 and 19 are patentable over Zweig and Yamada for at least the following reasons.

Zweig is directed to a computerized robot with an on board internet web server. Instead of having a large number of internal sensors, the Zweig robot moves to close proximity of external sensors for communication therewith.

Yamada is directed to an electronic toy or robot which automatically activates when the user is nearby. Yamada has 83

figures and 27 pages of text qualifying this patent as "complex". Therefore pursuant to 37 CFR 1.104, the Examiner must indicate how the reference is being applied. Since the references are complex, Applicants will confine their remarks to those portions cited by the Examiner, except as otherwise indicated. Applicants make no representation as to the contents of other portions of the references.

On page 10 of the Office Action, paragraphs [0314] and [0218] of Yamada are cited to allegedly show producing behavior based on user preference. Paragraph [0314] of Yamada merely discloses a robot that converts text data, received from a sender, into images for display, where the text may be read aloud. The sender, and **NOT THE USER**, may program, to his/her liking, the series of movements of the robot by assembling control codes corresponding to the individual operations. Further, paragraph [0218] of Yamada merely discloses controlling motors of a toy robot based on input from a user.

It is respectfully submitted that Zweig, the sections of Yamada cited in the Office Action, and combination thereof, do not disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 9 which, amongst other patentable features, recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

wherein the means for rendering produce behaviors and interactions based on user

preferences stored in a memory of the robot regarding rendering of said downloaded instructions **to the user** including pace of delivery, loudness of the rendering, and movements.

These features are nowhere taught or suggest in Zweig and the cited sections of Yamada, alone or in combination. Paragraphs [0314] and [0218] of Yamada do not even disclose or suggest producing behaviors and interactions based on user preferences of a user who receives the rendering, let alone disclosing or suggesting that user preferences are stored in a memory of the robot including pace of delivery, loudness of the rendering, and movements, as recited in independent claims 1 and 9. At best, any customized control is provided by the sender in Yamada, as specifically recited in paragraph [0314].

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable. In additions, claims 2-8, 10-16 and 19 are also allowable at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 9.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of

the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By \_\_\_\_\_  
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
September 15, 2008

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101

By       /Frank J. Keegan/        
Frank J. Keegan, Reg. 50,145  
Attorney  
September 15, 2008